UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/915,439	07/26/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010440US1 7368		
Frank C. Nicho	7590 05/21/2007	EXAMINER			
CARDINAL LAW GROUP			DASS, HARISH T		
•	Suite 2000 1603 Orrington Avenue			PAPER NUMBER	
Evanston, IL 60201			3693		
	•			DEL WENY MODE	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/21/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.		Applicant(s)		
		09/915,439 DUTTA, RABINDA		DUTTA, RABINDRANATH		
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit		
		Harish T. Dass		3693		
The MAILING DATE of Period for Reply	this communication app	pears on the cover	sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, I Extensions of time may be available u after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailin If NO period for reply is specified abov Failure to reply within the set or extent Any reply received by the Office later to earned patent term adjustment. See 3	FROM THE MAILING D. nder the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 g date of this communication. re, the maximum statutory period add period for reply will, by statute than three months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS COI 36(a). In no event, however will apply and will expire Se, cause the application to	MMUNICATION /er, may a reply be time IX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONED	I. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to commu	nication(s) filed on 22 D	ecember 2006.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL .						
3) Since this application is	s in condition for allowa	nce except for forn	nal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance v	vith the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1	935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims						
4)	(s) is/are withdrawallowed. ected. objected to.	wn from considera		,		
Application Papers						
	is/are: a) account that any objection to the eet(s) including the correct	epted or b) obje drawing(s) be held in tion is required if the	n abeyance. See drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is ma a) All b) Some * c) 1. Certified copies of Certified copies of the certified	☐ None of: of the priority documents of the priority documents rtified copies of the prior the International Bureau	s have been receiv s have been receiv rity documents hav u (PCT Rule 17.2(a	ved. ved in Applicatio ve been received a)).	on No d in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)		_				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-8 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dr Information Disclosure Statement(Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	awing Review (PTO-948)	5) <u> </u>	nterview Summary (aper No(s)/Mail Dat lotice of Informal Pa hther:			

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 12/22/2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

James Kramer.

JAMES A. KRAMER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/915,439

Art Unit: 3693

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hambrecht et al (hereinafter Hambrecht – US 6,629,082) in view of Kiselik (US 2001/0034631).

Re. Claim 1, 11, and 21 Hambrecht discloses a method, system and software, receiving a request for an enhanced certificate from a requestor at a **certificate** authority server [Figures 1-3B, 5-7C9 L47-L62; C12 L24-L48],

receiving a bid from a purchaser with a purchaser enhanced certificate at the aggregate exchange server [C14 L59-L65],

determining whether the bid matches the offer [C15 L48-L51], and

receiving agreement of the matched supplier and purchaser at the exchange server to execute the transaction [C9 L48-L62; C31 L55-L60; C30 L58-L63].

Hambrecht does not explicitly disclose determining whether the requester qualifies for the enhanced certificate,

issuing the requestor the certificate if the requester qualifies,
receiving an offer from a supplier with a supplier certificate, and
sending the supplier the purchaser enhanced certificate from the aggregate
exchange server, and sending the purchaser the supplier enhanced certificate from the
exchange server, if the bid matches the offer.

Art Unit: 3693

However, Kiselik discloses determining (evaluation) whether the requester qualifies for the enhanced certificate (qualification information), issuing the requestor the certificate (see buyers and seller eligible or ineligibility) if the requester qualifies [see Figures 3, 4 and associated descriptions paragraphs 32-33], and receiving an offer from a supplier with a supplier certificate (see price quote), and sending the supplier the purchaser enhanced certificate (RFQ) from the aggregate exchange server, and sending the purchaser the supplier enhanced certificate (price quote) from the exchange server, if the bid matches the offer [see Figures 3, 4 and associated descriptions paragraphs 32-33 and 04, 36-37]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Hambrecht and include determining whether the requester qualifies for the enhanced certificate, issuing the requestor the certificate if the requester qualifies, receiving an offer from a supplier with a supplier certificate, and sending the supplier the purchaser enhanced certificate from the aggregate exchange server, and sending the purchaser the supplier enhanced certificate from the exchange server, if the bid matches the offer, as disclosed by Kiselik, to provide a computer system to qualify buyers and seller based on buyer's and seller's profiles and match the buyer and seller based on the profiles for particular transaction.

Re. Claims 2 and 12, Hambrecht discloses wherein the certificate authority server comprises the aggregate exchange server [C12 L24-L48; C23 L39-L62 - see network]. Application/Control Number: 09/915,439

Art Unit: 3693

Re. Claims 4-5, , 14-15, & 22 Hambrecht discloses wherein issuing the requester an enhanced certificate comprises implementing at least one security feature, and wherein the security feature is selected from a group consisting of a user password, a public key cryptograph [C26 L39-L50; C24 L10-L15], a digital signature [C9 L48-L67]. Hambrecht does not explicitly disclose (5) an XML based security standard.

However, XML is well known used with Internet transaction. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Hambrecht and include an XML based security standard to use standard acceptable security protocol known and used by others.

Re. Claims 3 and 13, Hambrecht discloses wherein the enhanced certificate comprises financial data and identification data [account information; C9 L48-L52; C13 L43-48]. Hambrecht does not explicitly disclose credit rating data, and financial routing data. However, these are well known. For example, to apply for credit, the lender (financial institution) obtains credit rating before providing credit. Similarly, financial data routing is used for electronic transfer of fund to buyer/seller accounts. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Hambrecht and Kiselik to evaluate creditworthiness of buyer/seller and provide direct fund transfer to/from seller/buyer account.

Re. Claims 6-7, 16-17 and 23 Hambrecht discloses providing a hyperlink to the aggregated exchange server wherein the hyperlink comprises the certificate request,

Art Unit: 3693

and wherein the hyperlink is provided on a web site for access by the requestor [C11 L54-L60].

Re. Claims 8-10, 18-20, and 24-25 Kiselik further discloses verifying a portion of requestor financial information with an outside server, and wherein verifying the portion of requestor financial information comprises determining eligibility for an enhanced certificate [see out side source paragraph 32] to obtain eligibility information from third party such as Equifax for credit rating. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Hambrecht and include the above limitations to verify the eligibility of the traders by third party. Kiselik discloses updating requestor financial information [Abstract]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Hambrecht and Kiselik and include updating requestor financial information to reflect the timely rating of the requestor.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/2006 with respect to pending claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harish T. Dass whose telephone number is 571-272-6793. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

Art Unit: 3693

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James A. Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Harish T Dass Examiner Art Unit 3693 Harish 7Dan

05/11/07